

Remarks/Arguments

A. Claims in the Case

Claims 171-212 were rejected. Claims 171-212 have been canceled. Claims 213-251 are new.

B. The Claims Are Definite Pursuant To 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 171-212 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully disagrees, however to expedite prosecution, claims 171-212 have been cancelled.

The Examiner states, “entities are indefinite”. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant’s specification states in part:

An improved method, system and carrier medium may be used to configure a Financial Service Organization (FSO) production system. Such a production system typically gathers business data (including transactional data), stores the data, sorts the data, and collates the data into FSO reports used by various entities of the FSO.

In one embodiment, a multilevel business structure, which may represent the processing relationship between various entities of the FSO, may be configured. A processing relationship configuration program may be used to configure, and subsequently modify, a processing relationship structure. A multilevel node structure may be defined to correspond to the processing relationship structure within an FSO. In one embodiment, one or more rows and one or more columns may represent the multilevel node structure. In one embodiment, a node may be created and uniquely defined to represent an FSO physical entity and/or an FSO function. In one embodiment, an FSO physical

entity may be a bank, a branch office, a department, etc. An FSO function, in one embodiment, may be an issuer of credit cards.
(Specification, page 3 lines 3-13).

Figure 5a illustrates one embodiment of an FSO business organization. For example, the FSO business organization may be a global bank 2250. The FSO business units may be represented in a chart or a similar graphical form to illustrate the attributes of an FSO organization such as, but not limited to, the reporting relationship between various FSO entities, the reporting structure, the number of hierarchical levels between the highest level entity and the lowest level entity, the number of direct reports for an FSO entity. Each FSO entity may be represented as a node or a block on an FSO organizational chart. For example, global bank is represented as node 2250, the business unit for Americas by node 2252, the business unit for Europe, Middle East and Africa by node 2252. Each node may have a parent node and one or more children nodes. For example, USA business unit has a parent node i.e., Americas 2252 and has two children nodes, i.e., region aue 2260 and region auw 2258. Each node may be identified uniquely with a node number and/or a name. The FSO organizational chart may include multiple levels 2266 in the hierarchical relationship. A node without a parent may be described as a root node or a level zero node. A root node may include the entire FSO organization. The global bank node 2250 may be described as a root node. The FSO organizational chart may be updated, in real-time, as new FSO entities are introduced or removed by adding or deleting a node corresponding to the FSO entity. The FSO organizational chart may thus graphically represent the current, real world.

(Specification, page 24, line 26 through page 25 line 14).

Applicant submits that “FSO entities” is definite. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection.

C. Claims Are Not Anticipated By Kanai et al. Pursuant To 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 171-212 were rejected to under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,864,679 to Kanai et al. (hereinafter “Kanai”). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejections, however to expedite prosecution, claims 171-212 have been cancelled.

The Examiner states that the new submitted claims would be allowable if the independent claims incorporated all of the limitations of the base claim, and any intervening claims of the allowable claims 11, 28, and 39 as indicated by the Examiner in the first office action.

New claim 213 and the claims dependent on claim 213 (i.e., claims 214-226) now include the features from claim 11. New claim 227 and the claims dependent on claim 227 (i.e., claims 228-240) now include the features from claim 28. New claim 241 and the claims dependent on claim 241 (i.e., claims 242-254) now include the features from claim 39. As such, Applicant submits that claims 213, 227, 241 and the claims dependent thereon are allowable.

D. Summary

Based on the above, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration.

Bobbitt et al.
09/699,054

Applicant respectfully requests a one-month extension of time. If any further extension of time is required, Applicant hereby requests the appropriate extension of time. Applicant has enclosed a Fee Authorization for the extension of time fee. If any fees are inadvertently omitted, or if any additional fees are required, please charge those fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account Number 50-1505/5053-30901/EBM

Respectfully submitted,



Mark R. DeLuca
Reg. No. 44,649

Patent Agent for Applicant

MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.
P.O. BOX 398
AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398
(512) 853-8888 (voice)
(512) 853-8801(facsimile)

Date: 6/1/04